



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

AF

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/625,998	07/24/2003	Mark B. Lyles	068351.0142	9896
31625	7590	11/01/2005	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			LEWIS, PATRICK T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1623	

DATE MAILED: 11/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/625,998	LYLES, MARK B.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Patrick T. Lewis	1623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2 and 10-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-2 and 10-15 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ .
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election of vitamins as the species preserved from oxidative damage in the reply filed on February 24, 2005 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Applicant's Response Dated August 5, 2005

2. Claims 1 and 10-15 are pending. An action on the merits of claims 1 and 10-15 is contained herein below.
3. The rejection of claims 10-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been rendered moot in view of applicant's amendment dated August 5, 2005.
4. The rejection of claims 1, 2, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghosal US 6,235,721 (Ghosal) is maintained for the reasons set forth in the Office Action dated May 5, 2005.
5. The rejection of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghosal US 6,235,721 (Ghosal) has been rendered moot in view of applicant's amendment dated August 5, 2005.

Rejections of Record Set Forth in the Office Action Dated August 5, 2005

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
7. Claims 1, 2, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghosal US 6,235,721 (Ghosal).

Ghosal discloses the combination of DNA and vitamin C or a vitamin C/E blend (column 14). Ghosal is silent on the preservation of vitamins with the DNA; however, artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. In construing process claims and references, it is the identity of manipulative operations which leads to finding of anticipation. In the instant case, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure.

Applicant's arguments filed August 5, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Ghosal does not teach oxidative protection of vitamins and one would not be inclined to combine DNA and vitamin C for any reason.

Ghosal teaches all of the methodological steps required by the instant method. As set forth supra, artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. In construing process claims and references, it is the identity of manipulative operations which leads to finding of anticipation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As filed, the instant disclosure does not teach compositions comprising a majority of a vitamin subject to oxidative damage

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

11. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ghosal US 6,235,721 (Ghosal).

Ghosal discloses the combination of DNA and vitamin C or a vitamin C/E blend (columns 13-14). Ghosal teaches the use of polyethylene glycol as a solvent. Ghosal is silent on the preservation of vitamins with the DNA; however, artisans of ordinary skill may not recognize the inherent characteristics or functioning of the prior art. In

construing process claims and references, it is the identity of manipulative operations which leads to finding of anticipation. In the instant case, it does not appear that the claim language or limitations result in a manipulative difference in the method steps when compared to the prior art disclosure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghosal US 6,235,721 (Ghosal).

Claim 12 is drawn to a method of preserving vitamins comprising adding a sufficient amount of a purified nucleic acid aggregate of less than 50 μm in diameter.

Claim 13 is drawn to a method of preserving vitamins comprising spraying a sufficient amount of a purified nucleic acid onto the surface of the vitamin.

Ghosal discloses the combination of DNA and vitamin C or a vitamin C/E blend (column 14). Ghosal does not teach nucleic acid aggregates of less than 50 μm in diameter or spraying the nucleic acid onto the vitamin. However, in the absence of some unexpected result the recited limitations are not seen to be critical features in determining patentability and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. It was widely known at the time of the invention that the solubility of most materials is enhanced by increasing the surface area of the material (i.e. reducing the diameter). Likewise, the manner in which the vitamin and nucleic acid is contacted is seen as a choice of experimental design and obvious in view of the teachings of the prior art.

Conclusion

15. Claims 1-2 and 10-15 are pending. Claims 1-2 and 10-15 are rejected. No claims are allowed.

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1623

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick T. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-0655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 am to 3 pm (Maxi Flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James O. Wilson can be reached on 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Patrick T. Lewis, PhD
Examiner
Art Unit 1623

ptl